

REVIEW COMMITTEE

PG and E

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
245 MARKET STREET, ROOM 444
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94108
(415) 781-4211, EXTENSION 1125

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION
 LETTER DECISION
 PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

Pipe Line Operations Grievance Nos. ~~11-4-76-4~~
and 11-5-76-5

P-RC 302 and 303

Partial Filling of Vacant Watch; Relief Employee
Not Assigned to Fill Vacant Watch

IBEW 

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO
LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W.
P.O. BOX 4790
WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596
(415) 933-6060
L.N. FOSS, SECRETARY

June 23, 1977

MR. R. W. HORTON, Chairman
Pipe Line Operations
Joint Grievance Committee

The above-subject grievances have been discussed by the Pre-Review Committee prior to their docketing on the agenda of the Review Committee and are being returned, pursuant to Sections 1B(1) and (2) of the Review Committee procedure, to the Joint Grievance Committee for settlement in accordance with the following:

The grievances concern the alleged violation of the Labor Agreement Clarification, Titles 202, 205 and 208, Utilization of Relief Shift Employees. In Grievance No. 11-4-76-4, an Assistant Compressor Plant Operator at Hinkley was absent on May 3, 1976, on the third shift; and in Grievance No. 11-5-76-5, the Assistant Compressor Plant Operator on the first shift was absent; and in both instances, supervision did not fill the watches pursuant to the Labor Agreement Clarification inasmuch as the watches were not filled for the entire eight-hour shift. The grievants are alleging that the Clarification makes it mandatory to fill a watch for the entire period, and the Labor Agreement Clarification does not provide for filling of "part of a watch." This issue is not new to the Pre-Review Committee, although it is a slight variation from Pre-Review Committee No. 204 (Pipe Line Operations Grievance No. 11-75-1). In Pre-Review Committee No. 204, the Labor Agreement Clarification obligates supervision to replace an absent shift employee for a watch and must do so pursuant to the Clarification, Titles 202, 205 and 208, Utilization of Relief Shift Employees, dated November 1, 1967.

The Joint Statement of Facts indicates that in both cases the Company elected not to fill the watch, and in Grievance No. 11-5-76-5, the absent employee's duties were assigned to relief, and in Grievance No. 11-4-76-4, an Assistant Compressor Plant Operator was held over from the second shift for two hours to assist the relief who was apparently assigned the relief of the Senior Compressor Plant Operator and Compressor Plant Operator. The Pre-Review

June 23, 1977

Committee, notwithstanding the timeliness of the referrals to the Review Committee, is of the opinion that the Labor Agreement Clarification, Titles 202, 205 and 208, Utilization of Relief Shift Employees, dated November 1, 1967, provides for the assignment of duties to an employee on the same watch in the same or higher classification, as was done in Grievance No. 11-5-76-5. Further, the Clarification allows for the assignment of employees for less than a watch or an eight-hour work period. However, in Grievance No. 11-4-76-4, the absent employee was gone for the eight-hour shift, and the partial filling of the shift, in this case, was improper, and the grievant was entitled to be called pursuant to Section C3(c) of the Labor Agreement Clarification, Titles 202, 205 and 208, Utilization of Relief Shift Employees, dated November 1, 1967.

These cases are considered closed on the basis of the foregoing and the adjustments provided herein, and the closures so noted in the minutes of your next Joint Grievance Committee meeting.



D. J. BERGMAN, Chairman
Review Committee



L. N. FOSS, Secretary
Review Committee

DJB:rto

cc: HPPrudhomme
IWBonbright
LVBrown
Personnel Managers